IN SEARCH FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE AUTHENTICITY DEFINITION: HISTORY AND CURRENT ISSUES

Salvijus Kulevičius
Vilnius University, Faculty of History

Аутентичность – один из фундаментальных элементов культурного наследия, показывающих или призванных показать, что культурное наследие является несомненно подлинным, что оно может репрезентировать "истинное" прошлое, воплотить "достоверные" факты и т.п. В европейской концепции охраны культурного наследия представлены две противоположные парадигмы аутентичности: исторической материи и исторического образа. Они по-разному трактуют сущность аутентичности культурного наследия (первая парадигма воплощает ее в исторической материи, уникальной и не подлежащей воссозданию; вторая – в историческом образе, который может быть реконструирован) и обращения с ним (первая парадигма предполагает в идеале консервацию объектов; для второй являются приемлемыми и восстановление, метод аналогий и т.п.). В настоящее время официальной считается парадигма исторической материи, хотя на практике очень распространена и парадигма исторического образа.

До последнего десятилетия XX века наибольшее влияние на международную политику в сфере охраны культурного наследия также оказывала парадигма исторической материи, которую стремятся закрепить в качестве универсальной концепции. Примечательно, что на практике существовало большое количество концепций аутентичности, не нашедших отражения в навязываемой концепции. Конфликт между желаемым и применяемым завершился отказом от универсалистской парадигмы и ее заменой релятивистской концепцией охраны культурного наследия, существенным принципом которой является признание того, что существует не одна точка зрения в вопросах охраны культурного наследия, а много точек зрения, в равной мере правомерных и положительных.

В статье представлен анализ истоков, контекста и последствий данного конфликта, а также развития и тенденций понимания аутентичности культурного наследия.The European Tradition: Two Paradigms.

Background. The first wider international debates on the essence of heritage and authenticity thereof at the same time started already in the 19th century. The so called *stylistic restoration* dominated in Europe at that time. Its unique practice can be interpreted as the concept of immortal spirit of nations. A characteristic feature of stylistic restoration is that one or another historical style of art, mostly Gothic, was considered as national style (consistence of the nation's self-expression) which, by virtue of the nation's spirit independent of time, can be expressed both in the past, and at the present moment through the representative of the nation. And these expressions were considered to be equal in terms of quality regardless of the distance in time separating them. Moreover, in the 19th century an architect, in terms of his skills (it was believed that they were acquired during studies of features of the remaining objects, general style and local schools thereof), was equated to a Gothic designer in the 13th century, and distinction between the new creation (Neo-Gothic) and an historical object (Gothic) had no significant meaning. A specific historical object was considered valuable as long as it met the universalised aesthetic canons of national style: if something was done imperfectly or lost within the course of history, it could be fixed now. In 1854 Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, the most prominent architect-restorer in Europe at that time, described restoration as follows: "To restore an edifice means neither to maintain it, nor to repair it, nor to rebuild it; it means to reestablish it in a finished state, which may in fact have never existed at any given time [underlined by S. K.]" [1]. And this was not only an encyclopaedic definition but also a live practice which was applied for more than one decade in the 19th century: it dominated in all countries in Europe were heritage management work was undertaken. A fundamental distinction and feature of stylistic restoration is the priority of a complete view over historical (authentic) materials. For the sake of integrity or wholeness of a Gothic building later historical layers used to be removed mercilessly, and anything what had been preserved, what had been deteriorated or even had never existed was reconstructed or created loosely combining historical facts and creativity.

The prevailing trend faced criticism as well. Englishmen John Ruskin and William Morris were the most prominent and the most consistent opponents thereof. Unlike supporters of stylistic restoration, who

praised appearance and completion of a building, J. Ruskin embodied the essence of heritage in its age or historicity (1849): "For, indeed, the greatest glory of a building is not in its stones, not in its gold. Its glory is in its Age, and in that deep sense of voicefulness, of stern watching, of mysterious sympathy, nay, even of approval or condemnation, which we feel in walls that have long been washed by the passing waves of humanity [underlined by S. K.]" [2]. They qualified restoration practised by their contemporaries simply as destruction of legacy and suggested observing the principle of non-intervention instead – to confine to maintenance and conservation (1849): "Neither by the public, nor by those who have the care of public monuments, is the true meaning of the word *restoration* understood. It means the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with false description of the thing destroyed…. [I]t is *impossible*, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture [underlined by S. K.]" [3]. These ideas had an impact on the society. For instance, in 1855 Society of Antiquaries of London declared that heritage conservation work was considered acceptable, and in 1877 Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings was established for the purpose of fighting destructive restoration. Never theless the 19th century stayed faithful to stylistic restoration.

A detailed description of all this history is provided in subsequent historiography [4]. In this case the aim was not to retell known facts or to rewrite famous quotes but to draw the attention to that in the middle of the 19th century in Europe there already had been two trends of the concept of heritage that are still relevant in the 21st century. Basically we can speak about two paradigms: historical view authenticity paradigm and historical materials authenticity paradigm.

Historical materials authenticity paradigm. In the 20th century in Europe this paradigm was given the status of "the right" concept. The most important international documents on heritage protection, i. e. the *Athens Charter* (1931) and the *Venice Charter* (1964), were based exactly on this. Even though these documents are referred to as international ones, they are based on purely European approaches to heritage (see next section). The principles of restoration, which prevailed in the 19th century, were condemned and rejected: in the 20th century restorers have undertaken to eliminate (according to them, to them to correct) the legacy (mistakes) of the 19th century restorers.

The singularity of the paradigm is that historical materials of heritage is considered to be the major substance thereof. This is precisely what is verified when authenticity of heritage is checked, this is exactly the main object of protection. Historical materials is perceived as original construction material, historical stratigraphy, historical marks, aging process, or simply as embodiment of historical time [5]. The principles of perception of historical time become the essential features of heritage: every object of heritage is unique just like every historical event is unique and unrepeatable; heritage can not be restored just like irreversible flow of time from the past through the present towards the future, once it is destroyed, it is lost forever. Other aspects of authenticity, i. e. design, workmanship, setting, are also considered as important ones in case of this concept, however, in a sense, they are regarded as secondary in respect of historical materials or at least dependent on it. The design of the object is an embodiment of historical timeline as well, however, a design may be authentic, if it is made of authentic material. Authenticity of workmanship can only be expressed through authentic materials as well, because authenticity of workmanship is "Substance and signs of original building technology and techniques of treatment in historic structures and materials" [6]. An object can no longer have tangible forms and workmanship marks but the remaining materials (ruins) is still important. In contrast, design, workmanship without historical materials will be merely a copy, forgery, imitation and will no longer be qualified for the status of heritage.

Exceptional respect for unique and no longer restorable historical materials required unique principles of heritage nurturance. Priority is given to conservation measures – heritage preservation without touching the historical materials thereof, i.e. limiting to preservation of the current heritage, only eliminating the causes of decay. Restoration is considered to cause more or less damage to authenticity, even though it is acknowledged: "Once material has been cut and used in a construction, it has become historic and is linked with the historical time line of the object. Although restoration by replacement of decayed materials and structural elements will reduce material authenticity in the monument …" [7]. Reservation of the paradigm in respect of restoration is perfectly revealed in the principles of the *Venice Charter* [8]:

• the principle of validity: restoration "is based on respect for original material and authentic documents" and "it must stop at the point where conjecture begins";

• the principle of respect for historical layers: "the valid contributions of all periods to the building of a monument must be respected, since unity of style is not the aim of a restoration"[1];

• the principle of reconstruction (in case when a sufficient amount of data is available for reconstruction):

---

[1] Exception: "revealing of the underlying state can only be justified in exceptional circumstances and when what is removed is of little interest and the material which is brought to light is of great historical, archaeological or aesthetic value, and its state of preservation good enough to justify the action".

"replacements of missing parts must integrate harmoniously with the whole, but at the same time must be distinguishable from the original so that restoration does not falsify the artistic or historic evidence";

• the principle of reconstruction (in case when the amount of data available for restoration is not sufficient): "in this case moreover any extra work which is indispensable must be distinct from the architectural composition and must bear a contemporary stamp".

So everything newly added to the historical materials must always be marked with a distinctive sign.

Historical view authenticity paradigm. Despite that in the official level priority is given to the historical materials paradigm, the historical view paradigm still has a no less effect on heritage protection practice. Although the concepts and practices of the 19th century (stylistic restoration) and the 20th–21st centuries historical view paradigms have a common goal, i. e. to create a complete view, they have significant differences as well. Different consciousness stands behind them: aesthetic, seeing an object as an expression of one particular artistic style and appreciating it for compliance thereof with universalised canons of that style; and historical, perceiving an object as an individual, as embodiment of a historical development line typical solely to it. This also resulted in different perception of an ideal condition of heritage: in some cases it was sought to bring its forms to universal style canons; in other cases it was sought to bring it closer to the primary form or the one which existed at a certain period thereof.

Supporters of the paradigm usually do not settle for the present view of a relic and seek to restore the forms lost within the course of time. Therefore, in this case restoration and reconstruction are used more often in comparison to conservation. All this is done so that we would have full and informative historical form of the object. The changing needs of the society constantly put relevance on new relics. However, from time to time we face a situation when the available resources are insufficient. In this case, if the principles of only historical materials paradigm (which rather strictly separate heritage from not heritage) were relied on, we would often face the lack of resources. The consequences of shortage would have the hardest effect on heritage itself: this would lead to disappointment in heritage. The said insufficiency can be easily manageable as soon as we start relying on the other paradigm. Tools provided by it enable restoration of no longer existent but desirable historical object or the forms of its elements, and the consciousness accepting the paradigm usually considers the restored form, element not as an imitation of the historical view (which it actually is) but rather as a historical formation. A scientific justification that this form used to look exactly like this in the past turns a present-day piece of creation into a part of reality (as if

the object or the element had never been lost) and identifies it with relics which have retained historical materials in terms of quality.

The historical materials paradigm also considers restoration to be acceptable as long as it meets certain principles. However, in case of historical view paradigm, restoration, in combination with reconstruction, is the reference behaviour. Basically it thrives and exists by virtue of these two behaviours. In this case approach to restoration itself is much more liberal: analogies, hypotheses, or assumptions are considered to be acceptable as well; we do not tend to distinguish between the historical and the newly created matter; we do not avoid highlighting any one (usually the oldest one) layer of an object in this way ignoring or even destroying other layers.

Problem. The historical view paradigm embodies society's need to keep restoring heritage. The historical materials paradigm embodies its need to get acquainted with or to feel the true past through heritage. Their conflict is best revealed through the phenomenon of heritage restoration and evaluation thereof. On one hand, the public needs presentable and created (restored) heritage, on the other hand, the official heritage protection does not tend to acknowledge restoration as behaviour characteristic to heritage protection. Restored forms of heritage are merely illustrations of secondary sources (reflection of texts, pictures, or images), meanwhile existence of heritage as a phenomenon first of all is based on its ability to be the primary source of knowledge of the past. This is exactly why the priority of that view over materials cannot be officially validated: acknowledgement thereof would undermine confidence in objectivity of heritage. This drama is illustrated by words of Michael Petzet, ICOMOS associate: "Many monuments, including ones that have since been entered on the World Heritage list, have reconstruction to thank for their authenticity, a rebuilding that not only incorporated authentic fragments in the new, like relicts, but also some extent involved reconstruction on the basis of a more or less well-documented historical foundation. Monuments where returned to an authentic, pre-destruction state which had perhaps evolved over centuries or, in special cases, to a perhaps fictive "original state" which was nevertheless held to be authentic" [9].

International heritage protection acts do not attribute reconstruction to the discourse of heritage protection. One of the few exceptions is considered to be the *Riga Charter* (2000), a document of regional significance. This act, initiated by Post-Soviet Countries of the Eastern European Area (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine), reflects how the needs of the society affect the concept of authenticity. By means of the document it is acknowledged that international dogmas

"establish a presumption against reconstruction of the cultural heritage" and a belief is expressed that "replication of cultural heritage is in general a misrepresentation of evidence of the past, and that each architectural work should reflect the time of its own creation", nevertheless, reconstruction is considered to be an acceptable [10]. The actualization of the concept of historical view authenticity and the aspirations to legitimize it were determined by the society's need to newly identify themselves. Upon regaining their independence and taking the memory "apparatus" into their own hands nations found the necessity to revaluate the symbols of identity and to find new dominants giving substance / representing the nation. However, the necessity faced real or imagined lack of resources: the material expression of the current heritage seemed to be insufficient for expression of the desired symbolic content. They started eliminating the shortage by creating new forms – symbols. Simple new formations become symbols and values upon identifying them with no longer remaining historical objects and attributing the creative activity thereof to the discourse of heritage (this activity is usually referred to as *recovery / reconstruction / restoration* rather the concept of *construction* which sounds too routine). On the other hand, the activity of reconstruction has a symbolic meaning which is no less than the recovered object itself: 1) resurgent monuments turns rebirth of the nation itself into a monument and fortifies it (the process is provided with a visible and monumental shape); 2) reconstruction restores historical justice and eliminates historical grievances; 3) the reconstructed object is sterile, it has no negative connotation (for example, association with the Soviet period). None of the current relics is able to embody this, therefore, the new formations sometimes tend to have advantage over the remaining heritage. In conclusion, the *Riga Charter* simply legalized the actual situation in the region: *House of the Blacheads* (Riga) and St. Michael's Golden-Domed Cathedral (Kiev) was reconstructed in 1999; reconstruction for the Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania was commenced in 2002; etc. By virtue of the Charter objects which could not be classified as heritage have become a part of the discourse of heritage.

International Experience:
from Universalism towards Relativism

Universalistic paradigm. The attention showed to heritage by international organizations particularly increased in the 1950s – 1960s. Creation of Culture of Peace (in case of UNESCO) and search for common European heritage (in case of the European Council) have become the major ideological motors of international heritage policy and practice. They shared a common implication: heritage should unite the Europeans and the entire mankind. At first they tried doing this by finding or creating universal standards of

heritage and heritage protection that would be common to everyone. Two international documents were supposed to become the major tools of heritage universalization. The "spirit" of universal heritage protection was first expressed by the *Venice Charter* (1964)[2]. The document is important in several respects: 1) national heritage was recognized as the common heritage of mankind for first time and preservation thereof was attributed to the common responsibility of mankind; 2) international principles for heritage policy were formulated and the main heritage protection categories were defined for the first time. This document was more oriented towards creation of general standards of heritage conservation and restoration. Meanwhile, implementation of the idea about common heritage of the mankind and common responsibility for it was started in 1970s along with *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (1972)[3]. Based on this Convention development of the international World Heritage List was started. Spread and consolidation of the provisions specified in the documents were taken care of by international institutions such as UNESCO, ICCROM, and ICOMOS. It seems that assimilation of these provisions was not supposed to cause any dissonances: these principles were considered to be universal and objective. It was claimed and believed that they were created by working together and were formulated at an international level[4]. Moreover, each nation was provided with relative freedom in respect of application thereof[5]. Unfortunately, as soon became apparent, even this relative freedom was too restrictive: the principles declared in the *Venice Charter* basically were in conflict with heritage protection traditions of some nations or cultures. It turned out that these

---

[2] The First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments held in Athens in 1931 and the *Athens Charter* passed during it are considered to be the earliest attempt to cooperate in the international level in the field heritage protection, however this document did not gain such popularity and spread like the *Venice Charter*.

[3] A document discussing communality of the heritage of the European countries (*European Cultural Convention*) appeared even sooner, i. e. in 1954. Although this idea did not gain such popularity as the world heritage, it is still tenacious of life and is kept alive to date.

[4] "It is essential that the principles guiding the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings should be agreed and be laid down on an international basis […]". *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964).* ICOMOS, 1965, Preamble. <http://www.international. icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf>.

[5] "[…] each country being responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions". *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964).* ICOMOS, 1965, Preamble. <http://www.international. icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf>.

principles were not so universal after all: they were "forged" by the Europeans and basically met only their concept of heritage. This is also proved by the composition of the international committee formed for preparation of the draft *Venice Charter*: 20 out of 23 committee members were European; not a single person represented the Asian, or the North American countries. The Europeans considered material immovable masonry heritage as the major form of heritage, therefore, the principles of Charter were oriented towards cherishing thereof. For example, different heritage preservation traditions prevailed in Japan at that time: here they cherished wooden historical buildings (and they still cherish them) when applying reconstruction practice. Within the course of it decayed matter is replaced with a new one, by the way, completely preserving the ancient forms, types of material, construction technologies. Moreover, a building is usually reconstructed in parts, i. e. by replacing not the whole but only decayed parts. In this way the entire building or individual parts thereof are reconstructed periodically. This practice is in principle incompatible with the European idea of restoration: let us remind that only objects retaining historical materials were considered as heritage by the latter, and all heritage protection behaviour respectively focused on maintenance of this materials. As a result of constant reconstructions, things considered as heritage in Japan may have completely no historical materials, and the reconstruction tradition itself, based on the European understanding, again was directed towards destruction of heritage rather than preservation thereof[6]. There was a similar situation with the World Heritage Program as well: criteria applicable to inclusion into the World Heritage List were based entirely on the European concepts of heritage. The European historical authenticity authenticity paradigm had become the ideological basis of the entire international heritage protection.

Relativistic paradigm. The end of the 20th century saw a cardinal transformation of the international principles of heritage protection. It was determined by perception and acknowledgement that (1) the international heritage protection was exceptionally an expression of the theoretical and practical experience of the Western Europe in all levels (starting with the concept of heritage protection and ending with the structure of organisations) and that (2) the latter specific experience was essentially incompatible with heritage protection traditions of some countries. In other words, at

___

[6] Manifestations heritage protection "disrespectful" in terms of the historical materials can be found not only in Japan but in other ranges of wooden heritage preservation as well. Regions of the world where the traditional building material is uncalcinated clay, for example, the Islamic Republic of Iran, also distinguish in this respect.

that time it was discovered that things which were considered to be common and advanced for the entire mankind in terms of the international heritage protection were not an intercultural consensus but rather imposition of one conception, i. e. the European one, to other cultures. Most of the discussions were initiated by the authenticity test which was applicable to all candidates to the world heritage status. In 1977 the test defined in *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* strictly determined what can be classified as this heritage and what cannot: "the property should meet the test of authenticity in design, materials, workmanship and setting" [10]. This test was based not on universal principles but on purely European historical materials authenticity paradigm. It is no coincidence that Japan joined the *World Heritage Convention* only in 1992, i. e. 20 years later from introduction thereof. It turned out that the Japanese culture, unlike the European society, paid little attention to the historical materials. Precisely in the end of the 20th century, after taking a closer look at heritage protection of the Eastern Asian countries, it was realized that the applicable authenticity test is not and cannot be neither absolute, nor objective in respect of everyone.

1994 may be considered as the beginning when the attitude, that single heritage protection and the concept of authenticity were possible, was overcome because in that year the international *Nara Document on Authenticity* was passed in Nara City in Japan. It challenged "challenge conventional thinking in the conservation field" [11]. The document internationally legitimized what actually already existed without any regulations, i. e. the presence of different conceptions and principles of heritage protection at the same time. Discovery of diversity encouraged to acknowledge the relativity of heritage protection and the attitude that the world heritage authenticity test would be applicable in such a manner that all social and cultural values of all societies would be respected [12]. Heritage protection of non-European cultures was given a motive to become an equal part of the international heritage protection. The Eurocentric absolutism of the international universalistic heritage protection was dethroned (at least in the level of declared principles).

The new heritage protection and thus the concept of authenticity are based on several crucial provisions [13]:

• cultural heritage diversity exists in time and space;

• all values attributed to heritage (values of different communities) and the concepts of authenticity must be recognized as legitimate;

• heritage must be considered and evaluated first of all by taking into account those cultural contexts where it belongs to.

Problem. It is debatable whether these provisions can actually be applicable, or if they remain mere declarations: the concern is how objective the World Heritage Committee, consisting of 21 representatives from different countries and making decisions on which heritage values may be provided with the world heritage status, can be in respect of evaluation of cultural values of a particular society, i. e. to what extent each committee member can disassociate himself from his own cultural experience and to empathise with another cultural context. However, in one way or another, the presence of relativistic heritage protection, as one of the forms of the international heritage protection, already is a definite fact. In 2005 the principles specified in the *Nara Document on Authenticity* became the official criteria based on which objects are selected for inclusion in the UNESCO World Heritage List [14].

Conclusions

1. Authenticity is one of the fundamental elements of heritage evidencing or supposed to evidence that heritage is definitely real, that it can represent "real" past, embody "real" facts, etc. This is one of the essential features of heritage by virtue of which it becomes relevant and this results in need to cherish it.

2. The European heritage protection provides a field for competition of two authenticity paradigms: historical materials and historical view. They are characterized by different approaches towards the essence of heritage authenticity (the first one embodies it in the historical materials which is unique and can no longer be restored; the second one embodies it in the historical view which can be reproduced) and behaviour with heritage (conservation is the ideal of the first one; the second one considers reconstruction, analogue method, etc. completely acceptable). Currently the historical materials paradigm is considered as the official one, even though the historical view paradigm remains very tenacious in practice.

3. The European concept of authenticity (historical materials paradigm) had the biggest influence on the international heritage protection by 1990s. It was sough to establish it as a universal concept. Unfortunately, in practice there existed a variety of authenticity concepts which in no way could fit into the concept thrust by international institutions. A conflict between strivings and practice ended with rejection of the universalistic paradigm and replacement thereof with a relativistic concept of heritage protection. The fundamental principle of the latter is acknowledgement that more than one heritage protection system existed and that all concepts of heritage were equally good and right.

1. VIOLLET-LE-DUC, Eugène Emmanuel. *Restoration. Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage.* Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996, p. 314. 2. RUSKIN, John. *The Lamp of Memory, I. Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage.* Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996, p. 42. 3. Ibid, p. 322. 4. JOKILEHTO, Jukka. *A History of Architectural Conservation.* Butterworth-Heinemann, 2002, p. 137–212; CHOAY, Françoise. *The Invention of the Historic Monument.* Cambridge University Press, 2001. P. 99–116; *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage.* Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996, p. 307–323. 5. FEILDEN, Bernard M.; JOKILEHTO, Jukka. *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites.* Rome: ICCROM, 1998, p. 66; 6. Ibid, p. 67. 7. Ibid, p. 69. 8. *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964).* ICOMOS, 1965, a. 9, 11, 12. <http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf>. 9. PETZET, Michael. *"In the full richness of their authenticity" – The Test of Authenticity and the New Cult of Monuments. Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention.* Trondheim: TAPIR Publishers, 1995, p. 91. 10. *The Riga Charter on Authenticity and Historical Reconstruction in Relationship to Cultural Heritage, 2000, Preamble, a. 5, <http://www.altes-rathaus-halle.de/ dokumente_17.asp>.* 10. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.* UNESCO, 1977, a. 9. <http://whc.unesco.org/ archive/out/opgu77.htm>. 11. *The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994, a. 1. <http://www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf>.* 12. *The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994, a. 1, 2, 6, 7. <http://www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf>.* 13. *The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994, a. 6,11–13. <http://www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf>.* 14. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.* UNESCO, 2005, a. 79–86. <http:// whc.unesco.org/archive/ opguide05-en.pdf>